



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

18 MAR 2009

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
600 CONGRESS AVE.  
SUITE 2400  
AUSTIN, TX 78701

In re Application of COUFFIN et al	:	
U.S. Application No.: 10/596,578	:	
PCT Application No.: PCT/CA2006/000772	:	
Int. Filing Date: 12 May 2006	:	
Priority Date Claimed: 12 May 2005	:	DECISION
Attorney Docket No.: BRKP:025US	:	
For: ABSORBENT HYDROPHOBIC	:	
BORONATE GALACTOMANNAN COMPLEXES	:	
AND PROCESS FOR PRODUCING SAME	:	

This is in response to applicant's petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) filed 06 February 2009.

**BACKGROUND**

On 12 May 2006, applicant filed international application PCT/CA2006/000772, which claimed priority of an earlier Canada application filed 12 May 2005. A copy of the international application was communicated to the USPTO from the International Bureau on 16 November 2006. The thirty-month period for paying the basic national fee in the United States expired on 12 November 2007.

On 16 June 2006, applicant filed national stage papers in the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US). The submission was accompanied by, *inter alia*, the basic national fee required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1).

On 08 July 2008, the DO/EO/US mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements Under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905), which indicated that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497 must be filed.

On 06 February 2009, applicant filed the present petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a).

**DISCUSSION**

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by: (1) an oath or declaration by each applicant on his or her own behalf and on behalf of the nonsigning joint inventors, (2)

factual proof that the missing joint inventors refuse to join in the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) the fee set forth in §1.17(i), and (4) the last known addresses of the nonsigning joint inventors.

With regard to item (1) above, applicant has submitted a declaration signed by the available inventors each on his/her own behalf and on behalf of the nonsigning inventor.

With regard to item (2) above, MPEP 409.03(d) states in relevant part,

Where a refusal to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of this refusal must be specified in an affidavit or declaration by the person to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Before a refusal can be alleged, it must be demonstrated that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature. A copy of the application papers should be sent to the last known address of the nonsigning inventor, or, if the nonsigning inventor is represented by counsel, to the address of the nonsigning inventor's attorney.

When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the affidavit or declaration. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the affidavit or declaration.

When it is concluded by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the affidavit or declaration. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the affidavit or declaration, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the affidavit or declaration.

The petition states that joint inventor Mohammed Berrada refuses to sign the application papers. Although the affidavit of Charles Landrum states that the application papers were sent to Erwin Schultz, there is no evidence based on firsthand knowledge that Mr. Berrada received the application papers from Dr. Schultz. Furthermore, an affidavit from the person to whom Mr. Berrada's purported refusal to sign was made has not been provided. Such affidavit must specify the circumstances of the refusal. Thus, it would not be reasonable to conclude at the present time that Mr. Berrada refuses to join in the application.

With regard to item (3) above, applicant has provided the requisite petition fee.

With regard to item (4) above, the petition states the last known address of the nonsigning inventor.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons above, the petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is DISMISSED without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of the petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Failure to timely file a proper response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application. Extensions of time are available under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)". No additional petition fee is required.

Please direct further correspondence with respect to this matter to Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.

*Bryan Lin*

Bryan Lin  
PCT Legal Examiner  
PCT Legal Office

Telephone: 571-272-3303  
Facsimile: 571-273-0459